UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

| NELSON OLWALDO MENDOZA, | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Petitioner, | |
| v. | Case No. 2:14-cv-13027 |
| DEWAYNE BURTON, | |
| Respondent. | / |

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

Michigan prisoner Nelson Olwaldo Mendoza ("Petitioner") has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging his state criminal proceedings. This matter is before the court on Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. # 13.) Petitioner asserts that he is not fluent in English, that he is unable to afford counsel, that the issues are complex, that he has a limited education.

Petitioner has submitted his habeas petition, Respondent has filed an answer to the petition and the state court record, and Petitioner has filed a reply to the answer, but the court has yet to review those materials in detail.

Petitioner has no absolute right to be represented by counsel on federal habeas review. See Abdur-Rahman v. Michigan Dept. of Corrections, 65 F.3d 489, 492 (6th Cir. 1995); see also Wright v. West, 505 U.S. 277, 293 (1992) (citing Pennsylvania v. Finley, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987)). "[A]ppointment of counsel in a civil case is . . . a matter within the discretion of the court. It is a privilege and not a right." Childs v. Pellegrin, 822 F.2d 1382, 1384 (6th Cir. 1987) (quoting United States v. Madden, 352)

F.2d 792, 793 (9th Cir. 1965)). Petitioner has submitted pleadings in support of his

habeas claims and no further filings are required. Neither an evidentiary hearing nor

discovery are necessary at this time, and the interests of justice do not require

appointment of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B); 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254, Rules

6(a) and 8(c).

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel

(Dkt. # 13) is DENIED. As is always the case, if the court determines that appointment

of counsel is necessary for any possible future proceedings (evidentiary hearings, etc.)

the court will take such action as may be needed without Petitioner being required to file

any additional motion concerning representation.

S/Robert H. Cleland

ROBERT H. CLELAND

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: March 4, 2016

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record

on this date, March 4, 2016, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Lisa Wagner

Case Manager and Deputy Clerk

(313) 234-5522

S:\Cleland\JUDGE'S DESK\C2 ORDERS\14-13027.MENDOZA.denycounsel.smq.wpd

2